

BUREAU OF ENVIRONMENT

CONFERENCE REPORT

DATE OF CONFERENCES: September 7 and 14, 2006

LOCATION OF CONFERENCES: J.O. Morton Building

ATTENDED BY: Jon Evan, Kevin Nyhan, Darrel Elliott, Christine Perron, Marc Laurin, Erik Paddleford, Mark Hemmerlein, Charles Hood, Bill Hauser, Dave Scott, John Kallfelz, Ron Grandmaison, Nancy Mayville, Steve Liakos, Robert Juliano, Mark Richardson, Kit Morgan, Tom Jamison, Dave Powelson, NHDOT; Jim Garvin, Linda Wilson, Jim McConaha, and Edna Feighner, NHDHR; Harry Kinter, FHWA; Jason Gallant, Louis Berger; Amy Dixon, LCHIP; John Watters, HNTB; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Company; Mark Wamser, Gomez and Sullivan; Deb Loiselle, DES; Matt Low, HTA; Jamie Paine, CLD; Matt Walsh, City of Concord; Gerard Fortin, Vollmer Associates; Pat Cutter, Consulting Party, Andover Historical Society; Greg Bakos, VHB; Richard Candee, Consulting Party, Portsmouth Historical Society; Carol Barleon, Office of Energy and Planning.

SUBJECT: Monthly SHPO-FHWA-ACOE-NHDOT Cultural Resources Meeting

Thursday, September 7, 2006

Salem 14883. Participant: Jason Gallant (jgallant@louisberger.com).

The purpose of this meeting was to supplement the information presented to the committee July 13, 2006, and to further review the cultural resources needs for the subject municipally managed bridge project in Salem.

Jason Gallant briefly reviewed the intent of the project to replace the Haverhill Road Bridge over the Spicket River. The bridge replacement will require minimal roadway approach work and impacts to the project area will be limited to the removal of the structure and reconstruction within its present footprint. The project will remain in the right-of-way, and there will be no work that involves the profile. It was previously determined in July that the bridge was not eligible for the National Register for its engineering significance. Photos of structures adjacent to the bridge site were presented to gain insight toward potential impacts to the nearby crossroads cluster of historic period residences. The dwellings are potentially eligible for the National Register as a district. It was noted that there are traces of a former historic corridor whose integrity has been since diminished with suburban residential development. It was determined based on the type of proposed reconstruction that the bridge project will have no adverse affect. While NHDHR would prefer a concrete rail, the proposed W-Beam was acceptable. J. Garvin encouraged the town to look at a concrete parapet.

E. Feighner stated that the project would not impact archaeologically sensitive areas as long as the project remains in the current right-of-way. If plans change, then this finding concerning archaeological sensitivity will need to be reassessed.

Action items: Berger will complete a Cultural Resources Memorandum of Effect for the municipally managed project, indicating that there is a no adverse effect as long as the project remains as currently defined. Berger should check with the town concerning the construction of a crash-worthy concrete parapet.

Acworth 14540T (no federal number). Participants: Darrel Elliott, Dave Scott, and Jon Evans.

Jon Evans began by explaining that this project involves the replacement of an existing Jack Arch bridge over Bowers Brook with a pre-cast box culvert on the existing roadway alignment. This bridge was severely damaged by the floods of October 2005 and has presented multiple safety concerns. Minor approach work will be conducted, however it is not expected to negatively impact properties on either side of the structure.

J. McKay stated that this structure was recently examined at the Cultural Resources meeting, and it was agreed because of changes to the bridge that it would be eligible for the National Register only as a contributing element to the adjacent surround district. Jim Garvin asked if the new structure would be enlarged to allow for increased flow, and if this would require impacts to the potential historic districts on either side of the bridge. J. Evans indicated that NHDOT, and several other agencies are participating in the Cold River, Bowers Brook, Warren Brook River Restoration Plan which may provide further information regarding the necessity of a larger structure.

Both Jim Garvin and Harry Kinter felt that this structure would not be eligible for the National Register given how much it has been altered. J. Garvin felt that the only unknown factor of concern was if this structure is one of the last remaining Jack Arch bridges from this time period. Despite this possibility, it was agreed by all parties that this structure was likely not eligible and therefore preliminary design could proceed. J. Garvin requested that the project be presented again once preliminary plans are developed.

Keene-Swanzey, HP-NHS-STP-F-MGS-MI-T-0111(004), 10309. Participants: Marc Laurin and Ron Grandmaison.

R. Grandmaison gave a brief discussion of the interim project impacts and how they relate to the ultimate plan, as detailed in the FEA, for the improvements to the bypass. Apart from the recently completed Base Hill Road intersection work, in Keene and Swansey, the agreement made with the Conservation Law Foundation (CLF) states that the Department is allowed to construct interim projects that only address existing capacity/safety concerns. The ultimate design will be re-evaluated if and when traffic reaches LOS E or worse. On September 12th two interim projects will be advertised – a two-lane roundabout at the Winchester Street intersection with NH 101 and an inlay and overlay at West Street intersection with NH 9/10/12 interchange with reconstruction of the Park Street intersection. Both interim projects will fit within the footprint of the ultimate project. The following are the estimated advertising dates for the remaining interim projects: T-intersection of NH 9 and NH 10/12/101 with NH 9/10/12 – Oct 2008 (on-shelf Oct 2007); multi-use trail “grasshopper” bridge over NH 101 – Oct 2008 (on-shelf Jan 2007); NH 101 Ashuelot River Bridge – not scheduled (on-shelf Oct 2007); and Main Street intersection with NH 101 – October 2008 (on-shelf Jan 2008). These interim projects will have no impacts to either the Park Street or the Main Street Historic Districts. H. Kinter stated that

since there were no impacts to the Main Street District, the HABS documentation would not be required at this time. The MOA agreements can kick in if and when the ultimate plans are being designed. L. Wilson concurred. L. Wilson asked for a report for their files that would outline the distinction between the interim and ultimate projects as they relate to the CLF agreement for their files. M. Laurin will put something together.

Lincoln SP-2006-6. Participant: Christine Perron.

This surplus land review involved a proposed 1,550-foot easement to the Loon Mountain Recreation Corp. for a new sewer line along the Concord-Lincoln Railroad in Lincoln. It was determined that this sewer line would not impact any historical or archaeological resources.

Portsmouth, BHF-X-T-0101(015), 13678. Participants: John Watters, HNTB; Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Company; Mark Richardson, Steve Liakos, Bob Juliano, Nancy Mayville, Charlie Hood, Kevin Nyhan, and Bill Hauser.

The purpose of this meeting was to present a new alternative, the Modified Replacement In-Kind alternative, and continue discussion of the alternatives. FHWA has indicated that the in-kind replacement option may be feasible and prudent; and suggested that a fifth option that involves a partial rehabilitation may be the direction to go. It involved replacing all the elements below the top chord. More work needs to be done on the alternatives consideration. Harry Kinter noted that cost of long-term maintenance could be one factor under consideration, but by itself does not constitute a valid 4(f) argument. The replacement in-kind alternative does not appear to have reached the extraordinary magnitude level that is memorialized in the federal rulemaking.

Dave Hall, the FHWA engineer is concerned about the safety and strength of the existing components if the lift span were rehabilitated. The current rehabilitation proposal encases the existing connections, which means that they could not be inspected and the approach would permit continued rusting of the built-up members. Rehabilitation does not appear to be a viable alternative.

John Watters made a PowerPoint presentation of the project alternatives, emphasizing a new alternative, called Modified Replacement In-Kind. The presentation included photographs of the existing bridge and photo-renderings of the alternatives. The presentation included a tabulation of construction costs and total costs (including long-term maintenance costs) for each of the alternatives. The presentation included a summary of the additional costs that would be incurred for different treatments of several structural elements of the existing bridge.

The lift span of the Modified Replacement In-Kind alternative would include: replacing upper and lower chords with closed steel box shapes joined with welded construction; vertical and diagonal truss members with built-up appearance and "X" lattice members to mimic the current appearance; and, modern steel plate girders and rolled structural shapes for lower lateral bracing and floor beam system, which is not so visible. The Modified Replacement In-Kind alternative would eliminate the upper lateral bracing and the sway bracing, since these elements would not be structurally necessary. The Modified Replacement In-Kind alternative would rehabilitate the approach trusses and towers.

A question was asked concerning how much of the original fabric of the bridge would be retained with the Modified Replacement In-Kind alternative. John Watters responded approximately 90%. This is arrived at by considering the entire Memorial Bridge as five major elements: two approach trusses; two lift towers; and, the lift span. The two approach spans and two towers are being retained and rehabilitated, thus accounting for 80% retention of the original fabric. For the lift span, which comprises 20% of the entire structure, approximately 50% of this span's elements would be replaced in kind, i.e. the vertical and diagonal truss members; thus retaining the aesthetic appearance of the original fabric. J. Garvin pointed out that only about 20% of the fabric would be retained. He requested that as much of the removed 20% be replicated, but did not have concerns about the proposal upper and lower chords and proposed structure below the deck.

There was considerable discussion concerning the character defining features of the bridge, particularly the importance of the upper lateral bracing and the sway bracing in the original 1922 bridge design and their visual prominence and structural role in the original bridge. They are diagnostic of the 1922 design. Additional costs to include these elements would be \$1.9 million for the upper lateral bracing and \$0.6 million for the sway bracing. J. Garvin also asked the source of the additional weight of the bridge. John Watters responded that most of it was coming from the solid deck and was the reason the weights would need to be increased.

Harry Kinter summed up the discussion by stating that there appears to be agreement that the two alternatives still on the table for the lift span are the Replacement in-Kind and the Modified Replacement In-Kind alternatives. He asked how much of the original fabric can be sacrificed for cost.

Jim Garvin noted that the project would have an adverse effect on the bridge. He asked if bolted members could, instead, be riveted. This process would add considerable cost to the project even if the technology were available. However, the bolts may be made to look like rivets. Also, the machinery house has been altered over the years, and DHR would like to see one that look more like the 1922 version.

There would need to be further deliberation on the new alternative. Since all consulting parties were not present, concurrence could not be achieved at this meeting. Unresolved issues are with treatment of the machine house, the upper lateral bracing, and the sway bracing. J. Garvin indicated that he realized that, while preferable, it would not be prudent to rehabilitate the bridge because of safety issues.

For the next meeting NHDOT and HNTB will refine details of what is included in the Modified Replacement In-Kind alternative and reexamine the costs.

Bartlett 14372 (no federal number). Participants: Bill Hauser, Steve Liakos, Bob Juliano, and Mark Richardson

The public meeting scheduled for September 18 was discussed. It was noted that the Commissioner's letter left the date of replacement somewhat open-ended which afford time to complete the 4(f) process after the public meeting and before the bridge needed to be removed. It has been realized that a proper 4(f) process needed to be followed before the bridge is removed. The first step is the public meeting. NHDHR would definitely like to see the bridge remain as an intact example of the high Pratt, single span truss. The public meeting is intended to gauge whether the general public would like to see the bridge remain.

Steve Liakos will lead the meeting, J. McKay will address the overall regulations, Jim Garvin will speak for NHDHR, Bill O'Donnell will review 4(f), and Bob Juliano will describe the removal process and the necessary permits. Although a construction easement is needed, there are no permanent environmental impacts. J. Garvin noted that Section 106 remains open since the mitigation was never completed. The bridge was not painted. It was agreed that the public needed to be invited to become consulting parties to the Section 106 process. It was asked why the 4(f) analysis was not completed for the Landaff bridge removal. H. Kinter responded that the need to complete it was overlooked.

Merrimack Village Dam (#156.01), Merrimack. Participants: Deb Loiselle, DES; Mark Wamser, Gomez and Sullivan; and Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Co.

The purpose of this meeting was to obtain further input on the additional information request regarding the determination of eligibility (DOE) for the Merrimack Village Dam (MVD) and potential that the dam and extant structures compose a small district. In addition, there was a brief discussion about archaeological resources at the end of the meeting.

Eligibility of MVD- Individual Form

Relative to the DOE for the dam itself, Jim Garvin indicated he would like more information on the rarity and uniqueness of arched gravity dams in NH that are comprised of either stone or concrete. In Preservation Company's write-up, they identified four arched dams (comparables) in the state, two of which were of similar date of construction as MVD. J. Garvin suggested that additional information on these four dams such as the height, length, drainage area, and other relevant information would be helpful. He indicated that unless new information was to be brought before them, they would likely lean to the MVD being eligible due to the lack of information and the assumption that this is a unique structure. Deb Loiselle offered to query the Dam Bureau employees to see if they are aware of any other dams in NH that were comparable to the MVD. Deb Loiselle noted that a field specific to spillway type was recently added but would take a while to collect and input the data.

Parties recognized that although the NHDES has a database of dams in NH, they do not currently have specific information on the design of the structure—in this case the database does not provide information on arched versus straight dams.

The group discussed that the lead federal agency has two options. One option is to have NHDES collect and provide to the Preservation Company information on the four dams already identified (this would include information on height, length, etc) as well as any additional dams that the Dam Bureau is aware of. Deb Loiselle verified that the information needed to do a comparable analysis would be to determine dams located in New Hampshire that are arched and are comprised of either stone or concrete. Jim Garvin confirmed this. This information would then be summarized and provided to the DHR as part of the additional data request. The DHR would review the information and then make a determination of the dam's eligibility. The second option is to forgo the additional work and collectively agree that the dam is eligible due to a lack of comparative information and start developing a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) due to the adverse impacts to a historic structure.

Eligibility of Small District- Project Area Form

There was considerable discussion about the eligibility of a small district comprised of the Chamberlain Bridge, dam, remaining canal and any mill foundations. Beth Muzzey at DHR reviewed the Preservation Company's Project Area form and requested that additional information was needed on a potential small district. B. Muzzey was not present at the meeting. Lynne Monroe noted that the eligibility as a small district was difficult due to the disparity of construction dates relative to the various structures, and other structures that have since been removed. Lynne Monroe noted the Project Area form addressed the eligibility of a small and historic district, making the case that neither existed. In the end, it was agreed that Lynne would provide a brief summary of what already exists in the Project Area form and forward it to the NHDHR for reconsideration. This summary should be sent directly to Edna Feighner, and she will distribute it to the appropriate NHDHR personnel.

Archaeological Resources

The attendees briefly reviewed the letter written by NOAA to DHR on August 4, 2006. In the letter, NOAA indicated the following comments (in summary) to the Phase IA Assessment for consideration:

- a) It noted the need to place test pits in areas of alluvium--- those depositional features that have resulted from the presence of the dam.
- b) The letter noted the need to locate test pits below the dam as these areas are not expected to be scoured.
- c) A phase 1A survey should include an evaluation of the historic fisheries.

Edna indicated that it is not uncommon to find artifacts in alluvium and believed that the test pits above the dam should be conducted as suggested by Kathy Wheeler. In the future, she noted that NOAA's letter should be reviewed by someone with an archaeological background as they would have known that artifacts are potentially found in alluvium. E. Feighner noted that it would most likely be difficult to have a professional archaeologist be solely responsible for explaining the demise of the anadromous fishery. Linda Wilson suggested that perhaps an archaeologist could gather the pertinent information and have it interpreted by the appropriate natural resource agency such as NOAA.

Concerning the need to excavate test pits below the dam. E. Feighner indicated that DHR needs to know if the sediments below the dam will be eroded, and if so, test pits would be required. E. Feighner also noted that if the analysis shows that sediments will not erode, they would require monitoring by a professional archaeologist. Mark Wamser asked her if, hypothetically, it was known with certainty that the sediment below the dam were not to erode, would test pits be necessary. Edna Feighner indicated that they would not be required if this were the case.

Plaistow, 14390 (no federal number). Participant: Matt Low (mlow@hta-nh.com) and Josif Bicja, HTA and Lynne Monroe and Carol Hooper, Preservation Company.

Matt Low explained the scope of the proposed project for the Garden Road (Danville Road) Bridge over the Little River (118/053), which includes: removal and replacement of the existing cast-in-place concrete arch bridge with a pre-cast concrete rigid frame. Roadway work will be limited but will include construction of a 5'-0" wide sidewalk on the downstream side of the bridge. The sidewalk will serve to connect pedestrians to the downtown shops and stores and provide better sight distance for cars exiting the bank parking lot.

L. Munroe and C. Hooper explained that they believe the bridge was constructed in 1918, not 1930 as indicated in the NHDOT Bridge Inspection Report. C. Hooper explained that Dave Powelson of the NHDOT Bureau of Bridge stated that the date of 1930 is somewhat of a default date for the construction of concrete arch bridges when the actual date is unknown.

C. Hooper further explained that although the bridge is in the vicinity of what used to be the Peaslee Mill with possible mill remnants upstream, the area is so disturbed around the bridge that little historical character is left.

Jim Garvin stated that due to the actual date of construction of the bridge being in 1918, it may been a Storr's bridge design, making it more historically important. If this is the case, documentation may be necessary. This will be checked at next weeks DOE meeting and NHDHR will follow-up with HTA at that point. The recording of the bridge may be necessary.

Henniker, 14106 (no federal number). Participant: Matt Low, HTA.

Mr. Low explained the scope of the project, which involves the Ramsdell Road over the Contoocook River Bridge (123/106). It includes rehabilitation of the 1937 Warren Truss to HS25 capacity, reconstruction of the outboard sidewalk, and very little approach and fill work.

E. Feighner expressed some concern with filling the existing overflow culvert with flowable fill as that may impact potentially archaeologically sensitive areas on Army Corps land. She will review the ASCOE file and the archaeological site files to make a recommendation at next week's Cultural Resources meeting.

HTA provided J. Garvin with a copy of the Engineering Study for his review and asked for his input with regard to details, the replacement of members, etc. In general, the committee is glad that the bridge will be rehabilitated rather than replaced.

New Ipswich, 14600 (no state or federal number). Participant: Matt Low, HTA.

Mr. Low explained that this project involving the Tricnit Road over Furnace Brook Bridge (139/106) consists of replacement of four (4) 4'-0" diameter concrete pipes with a pre-cast concrete rigid frame. The existing fire suppression building will not be altered aside from the addition of safety fencing around the fire pad.

The committee had questions with regard to this project and signed a Memorandum of Affect indicating "No Historical or Archaeological Properties will be Affected."

Lebanon 14532B (no federal number). Participants: Kit Morgan.

The current condition of the roundhouse, bunkhouse, and sand house was briefly reviewed and photographs were examined. It was noted that much of the rear wall of the roundhouse had been removed, and the roof of the building has fallen in at several locations. There was general agreement that it would be very difficult to rehabilitate the roundhouse for any use. One approach might be to remove the building, leaving the outline of the foundation of the

roundhouse and turntable in place and adding interpretation to the site. If a federal project, documentation should include large format photographs where possible, a site map, and description. It was recognized that considerable information had already been gathered about the building and placed on an individual form. The feasibility of the preserving the bunkhouse needed to be examined, since it has remained without a roof for more than seven years. The sand house can likely be rehabilitated. Kit Morgan agreed to the relocation of the depot onto DOT property for at least an interim period. [It was subsequently noted in the city's long-term proposal for the rail yard that the bunkhouse and sand house be rehabilitated for interpretation and use when it attained ownership of that portion of the property.]

Manchester, STP-TE-X-5285(039), 13493. Participant: Jamie Paine and John Byatt, CLD; Dennis Anctil, City of Manchester, and Ram Maddali

The intent of the Hands Across the Merrimack Bridge Project is to modify an existing trestle bridge over the Merrimack River into a pedestrian bridge. The bridge has a two-girder span over the F.E. Everett Turnpike that was added during the turnpike widening in 1985. The bridge currently carries a 12-inch gas main owned by Keyspan Energy.

Features Removed From Project

Originally the project was to have a steel arch constructed over the turnpike that replicated Manchester's Notre Dame Bridge (which has since been replaced) and it was to have large concrete pillars at the west abutment and westernmost and easternmost piers. These components have been removed from the plans due to budget constraints. Also, the existing trestle bridge was to be completely stripped of the remainder of its existing paint system and then repainted. The complete stripping and painting has also been removed from the project due to budget constraints.

Floor Beam Attachment Revision

The walkway along the trestle portion consists of a timber deck placed on top of steel stringers and floor beams. The steel floor beams shall now be bolted to the existing trestle top chord by removing the existing rivets and bolting through those holes (instead of clamping the floor beams to the structure). This revised method to secure the floor beams is required to provide a more secure connection with the bridge structure. The existing rivets would have gotten in the way and created an irregular connection, if the system had been clamped down.

Paint and Primer Steps

The trestle will still have some paint removed. The existing paint consists of a red lead primer and tar topcoat and is considered to be in total failure. No significant corrosion of the existing steel members has yet occurred, though. The existing paint and primer will have to be removed from the area where the existing trestle top chord is in contact with the proposed floor beams. The paint and primer in those areas will be removed and the surface primed. The removal material will be contained as was originally planned for the complete paint removal and repainting. Containment may include use of vacuum equipment. A full specification for painting and containment and environmental protection is being prepared.

Lighting

Lighting on the bridge would consist of Amoskeag style lighting (used throughout the Manchester Millyards) on the portion of the bridge that carries the path over the river. In

addition, the portion of bridge that spans Interstate 293 would have lighting attached to the railings that points directly down to the path, so as not to be a distraction to drivers below.

Corporate Sponsorship/Arches

At the end of each pathway leading to the bridge, there is now proposed to be an archway over the path with a corporate sponsor's name acknowledged on them. The arches would be similar to those seen in the vicinity of Elm Street. The arches would cross over the path as it leads to the bridge. They would be located perpendicular to I-293 and is not expected to be a distraction to drivers.

Archaeological Monitoring Waiver Request

When the project was previously presented, the southeast quadrant/corner of the project area was determined to be potentially sensitive for archaeological resources. Construction monitoring by a professional archaeologist was required for this area. Since that time, private condominium complexes have been built in this location and it is felt that construction monitoring would not be necessary any longer.

Keyspan Walkway (privately funded)

In order for Keyspan Energy to be able to access their gas main on the bridge once the pedestrian crossing is built, they are proposing to construct a walkway on the bottom trestle chord and in a crawl space between the turnpike overpass beams. Access to the walkway from the proposed pedestrian bridge will be provided. Preliminary plans have been developed, which include several configurations, all of which involve connection of new grating and support beams to the existing steel. Where the connection is made to the existing steel, whether by welding or bolting, the existing paint and primer will have to be removed similar to as described above for the pedestrian bridge modifications. Similar methods of paint and primer containment will be used.

NHDHR/FHWA Determination

Hands Across the Merrimack Project

NHDHR determined the following:

- ❖ The revised method to secure the floor beams to the bridge structure is appropriate for this project.
- ❖ The limited removal of paint and use of primer during installation of floor beams is appropriate.
- ❖ As the NHDHR's archaeologist representative, Edna Feighner, was not present, CLD was requested to contact and coordinate with her to determine whether or not the requirement for archaeological monitoring can be waived.
- ❖ The project, as currently proposed, would continue to have No Adverse Effect on Historic or Archaeological Resources.

FHWA Concern:

Harry Kinter stated that there had been extensive discussions previously with NHDOT, FHWA and the City regarding the previous proposal to have a corporate sponsor acknowledged over I-293. He stated that any new acknowledgement signs must not be a distraction to motorists on the

highway and design plans for these signs must be coordinated and approved through the appropriate persons at NHDOT.

Keyspan Walkway

NHDHR determined the following:

- ❖ The proposed means of attaching a walkway to the structure are acceptable.
- ❖ The project would have No Adverse Effect on Historic or Archaeological Resources.

Scenic Byways (Stewartstown, X-A000(496), 14767 and Carroll, 14768, X-A000(497): Participants: Tom Jamison and Carol Barleon, Office of Energy and Planning.

Carol Barleon requested a discussion of requirements for cultural resources review of two Scenic Byway projects: an overlook near the Mt. Washington Hotel along NH Route 302 near a former motel and a historic resource protection project which includes three parking areas and an interpretive center at the Poore Family farm in Stewartstown.

It was agreed that the project in Carroll, the overlook near the railroad corridor, would not have an adverse visual effect on the Mount Washington Hotel, which is a National Landmark. A decision about the potential level of sensitivity was left open until E. Feighner could review the area. [E. Feighner responded that since the area was likely quite disturbed, no archaeological survey would be necessary.] Thus, no further cultural resources review is needed for this project.]

The Poore Family Farm is located on NH Route 145 and includes a considerable concentration of historic buildings. In addition to protecting the farm, the project is opening the farm to public interpretation. Linda Wilson was not sure that the farm had been evaluated for National Register eligibility. She will ask Beth Muzzey what the DHR has on file about the farm. She noted that such a determination was necessary to establish the boundary of the property and to assess the nature of the project's effects on the farm. The property also appeared sensitive for historical and Native American archaeology. The existence of former outbuildings in the vicinity of the parking areas is not known. Additionally, Native Americans may have occupied the high terrace above adjacent Bishop Creek.

[It was subsequently found that a determination of eligibility for the farm had not been completed and was needed for the Scenic Byway project, and that a combined Phase IA and Phase IB archaeological survey should be conducted within the areas of project disturbance. The project area appears sensitive for both historical and Native American archaeological resources. Although the Scenic Byways funds can not be used for such a study, the project has also received an LCHIP grant which can be used for cultural resources survey.]

FEMA Projects: Cass Road Bridge and Whittier Bridge (no project numbers). Participant: Dave Powelson.

Dave Powelson stated that two bridges numbered 128/120 and 128/121, which together compose the Cass Road over the Suncook River, had been damaged by the May floods and had become a

FEMA project. They are I-Beam stringer bridges with wood decks built in 1940. However, he wondered if the dry-laid stone abutments were historically important. During flooding, the bridge had restricted the river, and the fines had been removed from the abutment. D. Powelson stated that NHDOT would need to recommend that the bridge be replaced because they are not substantial enough. He wondered if the abutments had historical value. J. Garvin responded that there was no defensible method of evaluating stone abutments without the associated bridge. They would not be eligible by themselves.

The Whittier Bridge on Old NH Route 125 over Bearcamp River (108/333) in West Ossipee Village was also damaged by flooding. It is a Paddleford Truss with added arches built in the 1870s. Milton Graton rehabilitated the bridge in 1983. It was closed to traffic in 1989. It is now in danger of collapse. Arnold Graton has looked at it and consulted with Dave Fachetti. They agreed that it might not stand unless a temporary support is placed underneath it. The Jeffords funds would have been a good source of funding, but monies will not be available until the next cycle. During the rehabilitation, the bottom chords were reconstructed with smaller timbers. The top and bottom chords are now rotting, and the load has been placed on the arches, which are becoming deformed. Sources of funds to protect the bridge from collapse were further discussed.

Thursday, September 14, 2006

Alstead X-A000(425), 14540M. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

Joyce McKay discussed the buyout program and the treatment of historic buildings. Although, the 14540M project will not be purchasing or demolishing these buildings, discussion focused around the treatments depending upon the funding source. NHDHR requested a HABS document for 39 River Street and a HAER document for 18 High Street to document the portions that were utilized as a foundry and other significant functions. NHDHR also requested a district area form for Alstead Village if federal funds are involved. The project will be reviewed again at the next meeting.

Concord, X-A000(090), 13889: Participant: Matt Walsh, City of Concord (mwalsh@onconcord.com).

Matt Walsh, City of Concord, met with the NHDOT Cultural Resources committee to discuss construction of two new bus shelters in Downtown Concord. He presented concepts for shelters to be located at the State House Plaza (sidewalk along N. Main Street) as well as near Pompanoosic Mills retail store at Eagle Square (just north of the Clock Tower, east side of N. Main Street).

The following was decided.

State House Plaza Shelter:

- The overall design is too futuristic for the location. It was recommended that the Architect research late 19th / early 20th century bus shelters from Boston and other cities.
- Materials need to reflect those of period architecture in downtown. Copper roofing (like Clock Tower) and wrought iron (or similar material) for framing was discussed.

- Location of the shelter on the plaza was discussed. It was the general consensus that the structure cannot be shifted to the south (i.e. corner of Capitol Street and N. Main) due to sight distance issues, which would be created for pedestrian and vehicular traffic. It was agreed the project should be shifted to the north to be closer to the intersection of Park and N. Main Streets. This will allow additional room for public use of the plaza (demonstrations, annual tree lighting ceremony, etc.) as well as maintain the view of the State House.
- Due to the seasonal nature of the Greater Concord Chamber of Commerce kiosk, this structure does not need to be incorporated into the project.

Eagle Square Plaza:

- Overall design was determined to be similar to Late 19th Century Parisian. Overall size and scale of the structure was acceptable, but materials and design (roof line) should be modified to better complement downtown's historic period.
- The idea of an awning at the main entrance to the Eagle Hotel, in lieu of a stand-alone shelter, was discussed. It was the group's consensus that this was a good idea and worth pursuing.
- Matt Walsh indicated that should the City may shift the location of a stand-alone shelter south in order to avoid impacts on Pompanoosic Mills, one of downtown's most prominent retailers. This was acceptable to the committee.
- The committee also supported the concept of constructing the shelter between building buttresses on the south side of the Eagle Square entrance. However, Mr. Walsh explained that this option is not preferred as patrons would not be able to see approaching buses.

Miscellaneous:

- The design of both shelters does not need to be identical as the character of both locations does have some distinct differences. However, both shelters should employ the same materials in order to create some sense of theme / connectivity.

Andover, X-A0009219), 14169. Participants: Kevin Nyhan, John Kallfelz, and David Scott, NHDOT and Pat Cutter, Consulting Party, Andover Historical Society (wcutter@tds.net).

John Kallfelz discussed the proposed project, which involves the replacement of the bridge that carries NH Route 11 & 4A over US Route 4 and the NH Railroad line. The scope will reduce the footprint impact of the interchange and increase safety of turning movements. Discussion included the impacts to Potter Place and the recreational trail on the old railroad line. Consulting parties were represented by Pat Cutter, Andover Historical Society and Alex Bernhard, Friends of the Northern Rail Line.

Ms. Cutter was concerned with the impacts to Potter Place. The current scope does not impact Potter Place, and Ms. Cutter supported the project. Mr. Bernhard was concerned with the rail line

and the type and size of the bridge structure to allow safe multiuse along the corridor. J. Kallfelz reiterated statements from a previous meeting, indicating that Mr. Bernhard's concerns were met.

Linda Wilson was concerned with traffic volumes and how the intersection would handle traffic generated from a ski development in Danbury. J. Kallfelz responded that traffic would be addressed during the permitting phase. She also indicated that additional buildings had been associated with Potter Place prior to the construction of the current intersection and was concerned that the work might impact these remains. Residents of the area had expressed concern about the project. L. Wilson and E. Feighner requested an initial phase of archaeological survey near the bridge to document any visible remains in the area. J. McKay responded that she would request an area history with attention to the location of original buildings from an architectural historian and combine that with mapping and description of visible remains by a historical archaeologist. Identified resources would then be protected by orange fencing during construction.

Londonderry, X-A000(072), 13872: Participant: Gerry Fortin and Mike Leach, Vollmer Associates (gfortin@vollmer.com).

Gerry Fortin opened the meeting with a brief overview and description of the project purpose, including the project limits and the proposed phasing for the project to address funding as requested by the Town of Londonderry. He described the general goal of connecting the existing schools (Kindergarten, Elementary School, High School and Middle School), the town's Common and connection with adjacent neighborhoods. The walkway would meander thorough the school properties and adjacent apple orchards where possible, and the sidewalk would be constructed along the roadways with curbing in other locations. This is a CMAQ funded project.

A more specific description of the project location along Mammoth Road (NH Route 128) and along Pillsbury Road was presented. The description included the location of the sidewalk along the roadways and the location of the walkway on properties along the route. The project affects eleven (11) properties along the route, which include one property owned by the town. The town has obtained four (4) agreements from abutters to date and is pursuing the remaining easements with the remaining abutters at this time.

The Morrison House owned by the Londonderry Historical Society is one of the affected properties, and is located in the town's historic district. Vollmer and the town have met with the historical society on several occasions to place the sidewalk in a location acceptable to the society. The historical society granted approval of the location shown with conditions that include a specific pavement color on the property and relocation of the beehives. A copy of the Certificate of Approval was provided.

The question was asked whether the gas line was old or new. Mr. Leach explained that there are two gas lines, one old and a new one. The new one was put in to serve the power plant located in North Londonderry near the airport and replaced an existing line. It was noted that as part of the new gas line work, archaeological sensitive areas were identified along the gas line route. It was indicated that very little work was done relative to the archeological areas for the gas line.

The question was asked if any archaeological survey was done in the location of the treatment swale near the apple orchards adjacent to the gas line and the treatment swale on the town's property in the woods. None was done in either location. Mr. Fortin noted that an archaeological survey was performed as part of the Mammoth Road sewer project but the limits may not extend

this far. Discussion of the Morrison House, flax fields, and Native American sites in the area was raised. Edna Feighner recommended that a Phase 1A and 1B archaeological survey be conducted along Pillsbury Road and that it include the areas where treatment swales are proposed. Discussion of archaeological survey along Mammoth Road was discussed but it was concluded that it was not necessary for this project. The NHDHR may have some information about the archaeological survey along Pillsbury Road. Vollmer will meet with E. Feighner and obtain and review information from NHDHR relative archaeological survey along Pillsbury Road.

The question was asked if there would be any 4(f) issues for this project. It was noted that the project would likely be beneficial to the historical properties. It also was noted that state and federal easements have been obtained from Moose Hill Orchards as part of the Exit 4A project. The easement properties were noted to be on the south side of Pillsbury Road across from this project. It was noted that Vollmer has already received approval from the Londonderry Historical Commission. L. Wilson noted that as defined the project would have no adverse effect. And L. Wilson and H. Kinter agreed that there would be no 4(f).

Surplus Land in Meredith and Belmont. Participant: Mark Hemmerlein.

For the Belmont surplus land, two parcels were discussed. The B parcel or McGraff parcel was purchased for a bypass that was never completed. Because the parcel sits above Lake Winnisquam, an archaeological survey of the parcel would be needed prior to its transfer. The A parcel is behind the mall. This location is also archaeologically sensitive since it sits right on the lake, and its sale would also require all necessary phases of archaeological survey. No buildings would be affected.

For the Laconia surplus land, which is located at the Weirs, Scenic Ledges requests rights of access to a dock on the lake across the railroad tracks. The NHDOT would just lease the access. E. Feighner concluded that there would be no survey needed as long as no ground disturbing activities took place. There may be a phased survey needed if Scenic Ledges wishes to extend the dock.

Jefferson-Randolph, NHS-X-0341(018), 13602. Participant: Kevin Nyhan.

After a recap of mitigation for this project, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed. While L. Wilson agreed to sign the MOA, she did not favor the current alternative.

Littleton, X-A000(046), 13861. Participants: Greg Bakos, VHB.

This meeting was requested by the Division of Historical Resources since they had heard that a reconstruction project is planned for Main Street, and they are aware of historic resources that could potentially be impacted. The downtown is not currently designated as a historic district. Greg Bakos gave a description of the project to the resource committee. The following points were made about the proposed improvements:

- The project consists of roadway, underground utility, and sidewalk reconstruction from Cottage Street to a point just west of Elm Street. These limits include the core downtown area. The Opera House does not fall within the project limits, though it

was earlier considered for relocation to improve the intersection for motorists and pedestrians.

- Pedestrian safety and accessibility will be improved through the installation of accessible wheelchair ramps as well as through widening the sidewalk along the north side toward the road by as much as 5 feet in some areas. Sidewalks will be concrete.
- The existing highway style street lighting will be replaced with ornamental lighting. The style of the poles and luminaires has not yet been determined. It was suggested that the selected style be compatible with the actual early period (circa 1900 +/-) lighting, which would be preferred by DHR, and that Littleton probably has photos that depict the Main Street period lighting.
- New street trees are proposed to improve aesthetics, but the Main Street group has reduced the number of trees in areas where they would potentially hide the adjacent business facades and signs. The tree species have not been determined yet, but it was noted that the design team is considering the use of some Liberty Elm trees or comparable. DHR endorsed using typically American trees, as appropriate, rather than imported ornamental species.
- Only small pieces of the sidewalk work will fall outside of the existing right-of-way. This will be done to make space for diagonal on street parking near Parkers Market Place & Restaurant and the Post Office. Right-of-way may also be required to construct stormwater treatment facilities between Main Street and the river, and archaeological investigations may be required in those areas in these proposed drainage areas. E. Feighner indicated potential sensitivity for industrial and Native American sites.

Following brief discussions, the Committee offered an opinion of No Adverse Effects on Historic or Archaeological Properties as the project stands now, however a subsequent review will be required later in the design process. As it stands, H. Kinter stated that the project would not result in a 4(f).

Portsmouth, BHF-X-T-0101(015), 13678. Participants: John Watters, HNTB; Carol Hooper, Preservation Company; Nancy Mayville, Kevin Nyhan, Steve Liakos, Bob Juliano, Charles Hood, and Bill Hauser, NHDOT; Richard Candee, Portsmouth Historical Society.

The purpose of this meeting was to continue discussion of the alternatives and to reach concurrence on prudence.

Nancy Mayville recapped last week's meeting and the agreement that the Replacement In-Kind, Modified Replacement In-Kind, and the modern replacement alternatives are the only three alternatives still under discussion. Others have been dismissed as not prudent or not feasible. The latter does not appear to fulfill the needs of 4(f).

John Watters recapped the understanding of agreement on certain details as:

- Below the deck including the lower chord – modern materials would be used;
- Upper chord would be modern materials, welded, with no lacing;
- Lacing would be used on vertical and diagonal members.

Upper laterals and sway bracing are still under discussion and the form of the control house needs clarification. These elements are character-defining features of the bridge.

Jim Garvin noted that the project Would have an adverse effect, so mitigation is required. The Secretary of the Interior's standards require that deteriorated structural features of an eligible property must be repaired or replaced. If repair is not prudent and feasible, then the new feature must be similar in material and design to the original. This is an important consideration with respect to retaining the sway bracing and upper laterals, which were essential elements to the original design. Jim McConaha indicated that meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Standards would be a strong argument to retain the sway bracing and the upper laterals. The bridge forms a gateway to one of New Hampshire's most prominent historic cities.

Harry Kinter reviewed the alternatives in the Section 4(f) context:

- Do nothing is not prudent;
- Rehabilitation is not prudent;
- Partial replacement is not prudent
- Replacement is feasible and prudent
- Replacement In-Kind is feasible and appears to be prudent
- Modified Replacement In-Kind is feasible and appears to be prudent

Under 4(f), FHWA is obligated to select a prudent and feasible alternative that does least harm. This points to the Modified Replacement In-Kind, but there is a question as to how much mitigation can the NHDOT afford? Cost is a factor in 4(f) considerations.

Nancy Mayville said that there have already been concessions with the Modified Replacement In-Kind, which is \$1.5 million greater in construction cost than the Replacement alternative. This cost is a consideration for both Maine and New Hampshire. These concessions include the replication of the lacy verticals and diagonals.

Harry Kinter noted that he would need cogent reasons why the additional cost of upper lateral bracing and sway bracing is not prudent. It is 40.1 vs. 42.6 million. He believed that the Maine SHPO preferred the replacement in-kind.

J. Garvin inquired about the current design of the control house. He noted DHR's preference for a design similar to the 1922 design without the later modifications. J. Watters responded that the current design looked pretty similar to the 1922 version. J. Garvin suggested reusing the existing sway bracing on the new bridge. John Watters responded that the existing sway bracing could not be reused because it would be damaged during dismantling and it was less costly to use new bracing.

****Memos:** Bedford 13692A; Jefferson-Randolph, NHS-X-0341(018), 13602 (MOA)

Submitted by Joyce McKay, Cultural Resources Manager

c.c.	J. Brillhart	K. Cota	N. Mayville	Bill Cass
	C. Barleon, OSP	C. Waszczuk	D. Lyford	
	V. Chase	R. Roach, ACOE	H. Kinter, FHWA	

S:\MEETINGS\SHPO\06minutes\9-7-14.doc